



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,720	01/26/2004	Gilad Odinak	INTL-1-1039	2555

25315 7590 06/09/2010
BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM, PLLC
701 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 4800
SEATTLE, WA 98104

EXAMINER

ZEWARI, SAYED T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2617

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

06/09/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing-patent@blacklaw.com
blgdocketing@blacklaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/765,720	Applicant(s) ODINAK, GILAD	
	Examiner SAYED T. ZEWARI	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 March 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 5-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 3/18/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

2. Applicant argues that

... Larsson teaches that during the time at which the tandem of phone 100 and kit 160 are in communication with the cellular system (i.e., in a communication session with a wireless network), the phone 100 and kit are in communication with each other. Only at step 340, "after the communication is finished," that is, after the phone/kit tandem cease communicating with the cellular system, do the phone 100 and kit 160 end communication with each other.

According to the limitations of claim 5, the embedded phone, using information identifying the mobile phone received during communication with the mobile phone, is able to communicate with the wireless network associated with the mobile phone after the embedded phone and mobile phone have ceased communicating with one another.

Khullar fails to supply the teachings missing from Larsson, namely ending communication between a personal mobile phone and an embedded phone, and after ending the communication, opening a communication session with a wireless network based on a sent confirmation. The Examiner alleges that "Khullar discloses a communication system wherein

3. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Applicant is arguing against the applied references individually. Under 35 USC § 103, many analogous arts can be combined to meet the limitations of a claim. Larsson et al discloses most of the limitations of the claims. Applicant previously argued that Larsson discloses ending communication session also but only after communication with cellular system is finished. To counter this argument the reference of Khullar was supplied to show that ending a communication session with a device or network is known. Khullar discloses a system having two transceivers, say A and B. When this device is in communication and using transceiver A, the other transceiver B is disabled. This act of disabling transceiver B is effectively ending communication between transceiver B and other devices. So the combination of the two applied references still disclose the limitations of the claims and thus valid.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. The rejection of the claims 5-7 under 35 USC § 101 is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2617

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larsson et al. (US 6,697, 638) in view of Khullar (6748246).

With respect to claim 1, Larsson et al. discloses a computer program product residing on a phone embedded in a vehicle for performing a method for automatically using a service plan of a personal mobile phone over the phone embedded within the vehicle (**See Larsson's col.5 lines 9-29**), the method comprising:

detecting the presence of the personal mobile phone (**See Larsson's abstract, figure 3, 4, col.3 lines 24-67, col.4 lines 1-20**);

receiving a mobile subscriber identification number from the detected phone (**See Larsson's abstract, col.5 lines 58-67, col.6 lines 1-15, col.7 lines 10-11, lines 18-25**);

sending the mobile subscriber identification number to a wireless network authority; transmitting the mobile subscriber identification number from the embedded phone to a wireless network access authority (**See Larsson's abstract, col.5 lines 58-67, col.6 lines 1-15, col.7 lines 10-11, lines 18-25, col.7 lines 10-11**);

sending an authentication request received from the network authority to the personal mobile phone (**See Larsson's abstract, figure 3-5, col.3 lines 24-67, col.4 lines 1-20**);

receiving a confirmation of the authentication from the personal mobile phone **(See Larsson's col.5 lines 9-29)**; sending the confirmation of the authentication to the wireless network authority **(See Larsson's abstract, col.5 lines 58-67, col.6 lines 1-15, col.7 lines 10-11, lines 18-25, col.7 lines 10-11)**; and after ending the communication, opening a communication session with the wireless network based on the sent confirmation **(See Larsson's abstract, col.5 lines 58-67, col.6 lines 1-15, col.7 lines 10-11, lines 18-25, col.7 lines 10-11 figure 5, figure 3-5, col.3 lines 24-67, col.4 lines 1-20)**.

Larsson discloses everything claimed as applied above to claim 5, except for explicitly reciting ending communication between the mobile and embedded phone. In analogous art, Khullar discloses a communication system wherein one of two transceivers are disabled for power considerations when another transceiver is in communication **(See Khullar's figure 3, col.5 lines 66-67, col.6 lines 1-31)**. {disabling one of the transceiver would effectively be ending communication with other devices with that disabled transceivers} Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Larsson by specifically using the method used in Khullar, for saving battery power, to deactivate and thus end communication using one transceiver when another transceiver is active, as disclosed by Khullar.

With respect to claim 6, Larsson discloses a computer program product residing in a phone embedded within a vehicle, the computer program product comprising:

a first component for detecting the presence of a personal mobile phone (**See Larsson's abstract, figure 3, 4, col.3 lines 24-67, col.4 lines 1-20**);

a second component for receiving a mobile subscriber identification number from the detected phone (**See Larsson's abstract, col.5 lines 58-67, col.6 lines 1-15, col.7 lines 10-11, lines 18-25**),

a third component for sending the mobile subscriber identification number to a wireless network authority (**See Larsson's abstract, col.5 lines 58-67, col.6 lines 1-15, col.7 lines 10-11, lines 18-25, col.7 lines 10-11**);

a fourth component for sending an authentication request received from the network authority to the personal mobile phone (**See Larsson's abstract, col.5 lines 58-67, col.6 lines 1-15, col.7 lines 10-11, lines 18-25, col.7 lines 10-11**);

a fifth component for receiving a confirmation of the authentication request from the personal mobile phone (**See Larsson's abstract, col.5 lines 58-67, col.6 lines 1-15, col.7 lines 10-11, lines 18-25, col.7 lines 10-11**);

a sixth component for sending the confirmation of the authentication request to the wireless network authority (**See Larsson's abstract, col.5 lines 58-67, col.6 lines 1-15, col.7 lines 10-11, lines 18-25, col.7 lines 10-11**); and

an eighth component for opening, after ending the communication, a communication session with the wireless network based on the sent confirmation (**See Larsson's abstract, col.5 lines 58-67, col.6 lines 1-15, col.7 lines 10-11, lines 18-25, col.7 lines 10-11 figure 5, figure 3-5, col.3 lines 24-67, col.4 lines 1-20**).

Larsson discloses everything claimed as applied above to claim 6, except for explicitly reciting ending communication between the mobile and embedded phone. In analogous art, Khullar discloses a communication system wherein one of two transceivers are disabled for power considerations when another transceiver is in communication **(See Khullar's figure 3, col.5 lines 66-67, col.6 lines 1-31)**. {disabling one of the transceiver would effectively be ending communication with other devices with that disabled transceivers} Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Larsson by specifically using the method used in Khullar, for saving battery power, to deactivate and thus end communication using one transceiver when another transceiver is active, as disclosed by Khullar.

With respect to claim 7, Larsson discloses a vehicle comprising:

an embedded phone operable to: detect the presence of the personal mobile phone **(See Larsson's abstract, figure 3, 4, col.3 lines 24-67, col.4 lines 1-20)**;
receive a mobile subscriber identification number from the detected phone **(See Larsson's abstract, col.5 lines 58-67, col.6 lines 1-15, col.7 lines 10-11, lines 18-25)**,

send the mobile subscriber identification number to a wireless network authority **(See Larsson's abstract, col.5 lines 58-67, col.6 lines 1-15, col.7 lines 10-11, lines 18-25, col.7 lines 10-11)**;

send an authentication request to the personal mobile phone **(See Larsson's abstract, figure 3-5, col.3 lines 24-67, col.4 lines 1-20)**;

receive a confirmation of the authentication (**See Larsson's col.5 lines 9-29**); send the confirmation of the authentication to the wireless network authority (**See Larsson's abstract, col.5 lines 58-67, col.6 lines 1-15, col.7 lines 10-11, lines 18-25, col.7 lines 10-11**); and

after ending the communication, open a communication session with the wireless network based on the sent confirmation (**See Larsson's abstract, col.5 lines 58-67, col.6 lines 1-15, col.7 lines 10-11, lines 18-25, col.7 lines 10-11 figure 5, figure 3-5, col.3 lines 24-67, col.4 lines 1-20**).

Larsson discloses everything claimed as applied above to claim 6, except for explicitly reciting ending communication between the mobile and embedded phone. In analogous art, Khullar discloses a communication system wherein one of two transceivers are disabled for power considerations when another transceiver is in communication (**See Khullar's figure 3, col.5 lines 66-67, col.6 lines 1-31**). {disabling one of the transceiver would effectively be ending communication with other devices with that disabled transceivers} Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Larsson by specifically using the method used in Khullar, for saving battery power, to deactivate and thus end communication using one transceiver when another transceiver is active, as disclosed by Khullar.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

8. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sayed T. Zewari whose telephone number is 571-272-6851. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-4:30.

10. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lester G. Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sayed T Zewari/

Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/LESTER KINCAID/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617